



Task Force on Trial Court Employees

Meeting Minutes

October 21–22, 1998

DoubleTree Hotel, Redding, California

TASK FORCE MEMBERS:

PRESENT:

Hon. James A. Ardaiz, Chair
Ms. Pamela Aguilar
Hon. Aviva K. Bobb
Mr. Gary Cramer
Ms. Karleen A. George
Ms. Diane Givens
Ms. Mary Louise Lee
Mr. Ronald G. Overholt
Ms. Christine E. Patton
Mr. Steve Perez
Sheriff Charles Plummer
Mr. Robert Straight
Mr. Mike Vargas

ABSENT:

Ms. Barbara J. Bare
(Represented by Mr. Dennis
L. Boatner, Marshal)
Hon. Charles D. Field
Mr. John Sansone
Mr. Larry Spikes
(Represented by Ms.
Allison Picard, Deputy
County Administrative
Officer)
Mr. Robert D. Walton
(Represented by Mr. Scott
Vivona, PERS Office of
Governmental Affairs)

PRESENTERS:

Hon. Steven E. Jahr, Judge of the Superior Court of
California, County of Shasta
Hon. Ray L. Hart, Judge of the Los Angeles Municipal
Court
Ms. Kiri Torre, Director, Trial Court Services Division,
Administrative Office of the Courts
Ms. Linda Millspaugh, Executive Officer of the Superior
Court of California, County of Glenn

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS STAFF:

Ms. Judith A. Myers, Director, Human Resources
Bureau
Ms. Deborah Brown, Attorney, Council and Legal
Services Division
Ms. Tina Burkhardt, Court Services Analyst, Trial Court
Services Division
Ms. Noema Olivas, Secretary, Human Resources Bureau
Ms. Hazel Ann Reimche, Human Resources Analyst,
Human Resources Bureau
Ms. Sharon Smith, Director's Intern, Human Resources
Bureau

OTHER STAFF:

Mr. Peter Kutras, Jr., Deputy County Executive, County
of Santa Clara

FACILITATOR:

Ms. Liz Schiff, Organizational Development Specialist,
Human Resources Bureau

Wednesday, October 21, 1998

I. OPENING REMARKS

Justice James A. Ardaiz, chair, called the meeting to order at 10:15 a.m. and welcomed everyone to the fifth task force meeting.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Justice Ardaiz introduced the following guest during the public comment period.

- Mr. Dwight W. Clark, Court Executive Officer, Humboldt Superior Court, also representing California Court Clerks Association (CCCA). Stated that CCCA will be distributing information to the association's 4,200 members regarding work of the task force and offered the task force CCCA's capability to survey and sample the general membership to provide direct information and feedback from trial court employees to the task force.

III. REVIEW OF SEPTEMBER TASK FORCE MEETING AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Justice Ardaiz presented a summary of the highlights of the September 24–26, 1998 meeting which included, in part: agreement upon working definitions for “county,” “court,” and “state employment status”; educational overviews of the classification and compensation systems used by the University of California at San Diego and by the executive and judicial branches of the State of California; discussion of transition issues and concepts; agreement upon a revised definition of “court employee”; discussion of basic assumptions relating to classification and compensation; and agreement upon the establishment of an advisory vote subcommittee.

Justice Ardaiz discussed the objectives and agenda for the current meeting. The objectives of the October meeting were to:

- Provide an opportunity for communication through the public comment period;
- Review staff proposal for dissemination of discussion documents;
- Provide educational information regarding the:
 1. Trial Court Budget Commission and the transition to state funding;
 2. Trial Court Model Classification Manual;
- Revisit classification and compensation assumptions;
- Discuss proposed classification model;
- Discuss proposed compensation model; and
- Discuss proposed approach for employment protection.

Justice Ardaiz asked if there were any additions or corrections to the September meeting minutes. Discussion took place that the "Public Comment Period" section of the draft minutes did not reflect the actual time of the discussion concerning communication issues. Ms. Christine Patton made a motion that the communication discussion in the second paragraph of the draft minutes be listed under another heading, since it did not take place during the public comment period. There was consensus to accept the motion. The draft minutes were amended to incorporate a new heading "III. Discussion on Communication" after "II. Public Comment Period" on Saturday, September 26, 1998. No other additions or corrections to the minutes were made, and the minutes, as revised and amended, were adopted.

IV. STAFF PROPOSAL FOR PUBLIC DISSEMINATION OF DOCUMENTS

Justice Ardaiz announced that the agenda had been modified and the discussion regarding the proposal for public dissemination of documents would not be an executive session. Task force members discussed the proposal to adopt a policy regarding the public dissemination of documents, which was developed to address issues raised during the September 1998 meeting in San Diego. A motion was made by Ms. Karleen George to adopt the Policy on Public Dissemination of Documents (Attachment 1); seconded by Ms. Mary Louise Lee and adopted by majority vote, with Sheriff Charles Plummer dissenting.

Discussion took place concerning the best way to communicate that documents distributed at task force meetings are "draft working documents" and that these documents are not the ultimate or final resolution with respect to the issues that they involve. Mr. Ronald Overholt proposed that documents distributed to task force members and the public in attendance not be considered confidential and that discretion should be used for any further distribution of those documents for purposes of discussion and input. There was consensus among task force members supporting this proposal, and modification to the task force's governance structure will be made.

V. EDUCATION SESSION: TRIAL COURT BUDGET COMMISSION (TCBC) /TRANSITION TO STATE FUNDING

Judge Steven E. Jahr, Judge Ray L. Hart, and Ms. Kiri Torre delivered a presentation about the trial court budget process. This education presentation included information about:

- Timeline for trial court budget activity;
- Budget development and allocation process;
- Growth in expenditures from 1994 to present;
- Line item budget vs. program budget;
- Summary of Judicial Council directives for FY 1998–1999;
- Sources of trial court funding for FY 1998–1999;
- Allocation to date of FY 1998–1999 funding;
- Issues relating to the transition to state trial court funding;

- Funding of negotiated salary increases; and
- Possible approaches to address future trial court negotiated salary increases.

VI. EDUCATIONAL SESSION: TRIAL COURT MODEL CLASSIFICATION

Ms. Linda Millspaugh delivered an educational presentation on the background and current use of the Trial Court Model Classification Manual. This model was adopted for use by the trial courts in August 1996 and developed classification standards that can be used to:

- Survey and compare to other court organizational structures and classifications;
- Identify staffing patterns and compensation across courts or departments within the court family;
- Ensure that employees are equitably paid;
- Measure external equity;
- Develop internal court reorganizations/restructuring; and
- Develop State Budget.

VII. STAFF PROPOSAL: CLASSIFICATION — ASSUMPTIONS & PROPOSED MODEL

Justice Ardaiz reviewed the proposed Classification and Compensation Assumptions, which had been discussed at the September meeting in San Diego, and stated that revisions had been made based upon input from discussion at the meeting. Ms. Liz Schiff introduced the revised Classification and Compensation Assumptions and a proposed Working Model of Classification to the task force. The task force divided into small discussion groups. During a full group discussion modifications were proposed to amend the Model of Classification proposed by staff.

VIII. CLOSING REMARKS

Justice Ardaiz adjourned the meeting at 5:00 p.m.

October 22, 1998

I. OPENING REMARKS AND RECAP

Justice Ardaiz welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order at 8:14 a.m.

II. STAFF PROPOSAL: CLASSIFICATION — ASSUMPTIONS & PROPOSED MODEL

Ms. Schiff reviewed the revised proposed Classification and Compensation Assumptions and the proposed Working Model of Classification revised on 10/21/98.

III. STAFF PROPOSAL: COMPENSATION MODEL

Ms. Judith Myers reviewed issues concerning compensation that were raised at the September meeting and presented a proposed Model of Compensation. Ms. Schiff facilitated a full group discussion regarding the proposed model. Task force members discussed and made modifications to this model. Consensus was reached on the document as revised. This model is now the Working Salary Model. Consensus was reached to adopt the document as revised. Justice Ardaiz stated that issues related to classification would continue to be revisited at future meetings.

IV. STAFF PROPOSAL: EMPLOYMENT PROTECTION APPROACH

Ms. Deborah Brown discussed and reviewed issues from the September meeting regarding employment protection systems. Ms. Brown presented a Working Employment Protection System model and the objectives staff used in creating the model. Ms. Schiff facilitated a full group discussion regarding the proposed model. The task force staff was asked to consider input provided by the task force and to modify the staff proposal for presentation at the November meeting.

V. CLOSING REMARKS AND RECAP

Justice Ardaiz commented that the task force had made significant progress on development of the classification and salary models.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:10 a.m.

**TASK FORCE ON TRIAL COURT EMPLOYEES
POLICY ON PUBLIC DISSEMINATION OF DOCUMENTS
Adopted October 21, 1998.**

A. LIMITED COPIES OF DOCUMENTS DISTRIBUTED AT MEETINGS WILL BE AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC:

- Educational presentations used during task force meetings.
- Meeting agendas.
- “Preliminary Draft Working Documents” that have not been thoroughly reviewed, revised, and specifically approved by the task force for public dissemination.

NOTE: Materials for or from executive session will not be publicly distributed.

B. POSTED TO WEB SITE: (Documents will be posted, as revised, as soon as possible.)

- “Draft Working Documents” that have been thoroughly reviewed, revised, and specifically approved by the task force for public dissemination.
- Meeting agendas.
- Meeting minutes, when adopted by task force members.
- Other updates and general information.

C. ADOPTION PROCEDURE FOR POSTING TO WEB SITE OF “DRAFT WORKING DOCUMENTS” WILL BE AS FOLLOWS:

1. The document must be reviewed and discussed by members.
2. A member of the task force must make a motion to specifically approve the “draft working document” for posting to Web site.
3. If there is consensus among the task force members to disseminate the document, the document is approved for posting to the Web site.
4. If the task force members reach no consensus, a majority vote must be obtained for approval to post the document to the Web site.
5. If a majority vote is obtained among the task force members for approval of the document, the document is approved for posting to the Web site.
6. Documents approved for posting to Web site will be identified with a notice advising the public that the document is a draft working document and subject to change, for example:

**“DRAFT WORKING DOCUMENT-SUBJECT TO CHANGE-
APPROVED BY TASK FORCE FOR POSTING TO THE WEB SITE –
(DATE APPROVED.)”**